

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-6, 9, 10, 14-16, 18-26 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 14 being the independent claims. Claims 1 and 14 are sought to be amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 14 may be found, for example, at paragraph [0007] of the as filed application. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 9, 10, 14-16 and 18-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,694,588 to Ohara et al. (“Ohara”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,035,094 to Kori (“Kori”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 1, as amended herein, is directed to a timing generator for use within a video processing device. The timing generator comprises:

a random access memory;

a plurality of microsequencers coupled to said random access memory that produce flags based on programs stored in said random access memory; and

a programmable combinational logic module, coupled to said plurality of microsequencers that generates control signals based on the flags produced by said plurality of microsequencers to support a copy protection process, wherein the programmable combinational logic module is *reconfigured to permit modifications in the copy protection process.*

(emphasis added).

Applicants submit that neither Ohara nor Kori teach or suggest each and every one of the foregoing features of independent claim 1. For example, as will be explained below, Ohara and Kori fail to teach or suggest at least a programmable combination logic module that is “*reconfigured to permit modifications in the copy protection process.*” (emphasis added).

As noted in the background section of the present application, copy protection processes (e.g., MACROVISION) may change over time. Although these copy protection processes are subject to change, they are consistently “implemented in hardware because of the need to quickly process...input signals and generate control signals to adjust an output signal.” Therefore, the presently claimed invention advantageously allows revisions to a copy protection process to be incorporated within the otherwise fixed hardware¹ implementation. In other words, the claimed programmable combinational logic module, which supports a copy protection process, may be “*reconfigured to permit modifications in the copy protection process.*” (emphasis added).

The Office Action concedes that the primary citation to Ohara does not “teach supporting a copy protection process.” (final Office Action, dated Aug. 31, 2008, page 3). Since Ohara does not teach supporting a copy protection process, Ohara cannot possibly teach or suggest a programmable combinational logic module that may be “*reconfigured to permit modifications in the copy protection process.*” (emphasis added).

¹ It is readily well known in the relevant art(s) that combinational logic represents a common implementation for hardware designs.

Kori does not cure the deficiencies of Ohara. Kori is directed to an apparatus and method that purportedly provides “a copy protection effect in all types of VCRs without significantly disturbing the quality of pictures displayed by television monitors receiving the processed video signal.” (*See* Kori, col. 3, lines 39-44). Although the disclosure of Kori discloses a specific copy protection process, Kori does not teach or suggest any mechanism to reconfigure a hardware implementation that supports this particular copy protection process “*to permit modifications in the copy protection process*,” as claim 1 recites. (emphasis added).

Since neither Ohara nor Kori, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1, the combination of Ohara and Kori cannot render claim 1 unpatentable. Dependent claims 2-6, 9 and 10 are similarly not rendered unpatentable by Ohara and Kori for the same reasons as independent claim 1, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-6, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent claim 14 recites “wherein the programmable combinational logic module is *reconfigured to permit modifications in the copy protection process*.” (emphasis added). As noted above in regard to claim 1, Ohara does not teach or suggest this feature. Kori does not cure the deficiencies of Ohara. Since neither Ohara nor Kori, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 14, the combination of Ohara nor Kori cannot render claim 14 unpatentable. Dependent claims 15, 16, and 18-26 are similarly not rendered unpatentable by Ohara nor Kori for the same reasons as independent claim 14, from which they depend, and further in view of their

own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 14-16 and 18-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Michael D. Specht
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 54,463

Date: 8/21/08

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
855860_1.DOC